

# **Holland Township Planning Board**

## **Minutes of the Regular Meeting**

**October 13, 2014**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Rader:

“I call to order the October 13, 2014 Meeting of the Holland Township Planning Board. Adequate notice of this meeting was given pursuant to the Open Public Meeting Act Law by the Planning Board Secretary on December 12, 2013 by:

1. Posting such notice on the bulletin board at the Municipal Building.
2. Published in the December 12, 2013 issue of the Hunterdon County Democrat
3. Faxed to the Express Times for informational purposes only.

### **Flag Salute**

Chairman Rader asked all to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance

### **Identification of those at the podium**

Present: Dan Bush, Dave Grossmueller, Michael Keady, Michael Miller, Carl Molter, Casey Muench, Dan Rader, Thomas Scheibener, Melissa Tigar, Duane Young, Don Morrow, Esq., Attorney, Bill Burr for Richard Roseberry, P.E., Elizabeth McKenzie, Planner, Lucille Grozinski, CSR, and Maria Elena Jennette Kozak, Secretary.

Excused Absent: Ken Grisewood.

Let the record show there is a quorum.

### **Minutes**

A motion was made by Dan Bush and seconded by Mike Keady to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the September 8, 2014 meeting and to approve the minutes as recorded with the exception of Carl Molter who abstained. All present were in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

### **Old Business:**

There was no Old Business scheduled for discussion.

### **New Business:**

There was no New Business scheduled for discussion.

### **Completeness Review:**

Block 24 Lot 3 & 13 – Huntington Knolls LLC – Minor Subdivision – Received into our office October 8, 2014 – 45 day completeness deadline is November 18, 2014. Memo from Attorney Caldwell dated 10/08/14 states “proposed division is for the restaurant use which has long since been considered to be divided from the remainder of the project. As such, there appears to be no need for a separate determination of completeness.” Attorney discussion needed. Board Action May be needed. TBD

Let the record show that Mike Keady has left the room and the building.

Applicant’s Attorney Caldwell is present.

Attorney Morrow stated that an application is needed for each phase as it narrows down to the present board what is being considered. Attorney Caldwell does not see a reason why the board cannot just look at the whole as part and parcel. A discussion took place with both Mr. Morrow and Mr. Caldwell explaining why each the belief they felt had was correct. Finally, Attorney Morrow as the attorney for the Holland Township Planning Board stated the board wants an application. Attorney Caldwell then stated that he made an application and is asking for waivers and he believes opinions aside, that the board needs to vote or do not vote. All board members want an application. Attorney Morrow also asked that a cover letter accompany an application and clearly state the intention of the application and what is provided. Attorney Morrow further stated that he is trying to help the applicant. Attorney Caldwell went on record stating he doubted that. A motion was made by Tom Scheibener and seconded by Dan Bush to deem this application incomplete. At a roll call vote, all present voted in favor of the motion. Motion carried. This application is incomplete.

### **Resolution**

Block 16 Lot 1.04 – Scott Shepherd-Minor Subdivision – Boundary Line Adjustment for Agricultural Subdivision - Block 16 Lots 1.04 & 1.02 – At the meeting of September 8, 2014 a motion was made by Dan Bush and seconded by Mike Keady to deem this application before the Planning Board as an agricultural subdivision with no completeness review being needed nor a public hearing. At a roll call vote all present were in favor of the motion. Attorney Morrow prepared the resolution for consideration.

#### ***RESOLUTION DETERMINING DIVISION OF LAND IS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES BL.16 LOT 1.04***

**WHEREAS**, Scott Shepherd filed an Application with the Planning Board of the Township of Holland for a determination that his proposed division of land is not a subdivision as defined in *N.J.S.A 40:55D-7*, and;

**WHEREAS**, the request of the Applicant was considered by the Board at its regular meeting on September 8, 2014 and;

**WHEREAS**, the members of the Planning Board of the Township of Holland after carefully considering the evidence presented by Applicant consisting of Exhibits and recorded testimony have made findings of facts as follows:

1. The property is in the R-5 Zone
2. The Applicant proposes to merge 6.992 acres of land from Lot 1.02 with Lot 1.04
3. Frank Shepherd and Joyce Shepherd are the owners of Lot 1.02. Lot 1.04 is owned by Scott Shepherd.
4. The lands to be merged with Lot 1.04 are presently used as grazing land and will continue to be used as grazing land.
5. All resulting parcels are five acres or larger in size.
6. No new streets are created.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that in consideration of its Findings of Facts as hereinabove set forth the Planning Board of the Township of Holland has on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2014 determined that the proposed division of land is not a subdivision as defined in N.J.S.A 40:55D-7.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Plat presented to the Board shall contain a statement that the Lot created by the division is to be used solely for agricultural purpose and is to be filed in the office of the County Recording Officer.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of a Resolution adopted by the Planning Board of the Township of Holland at its meeting held on

---

Maria Elena Kozak, Planning Board Secretary

The Resolution was presented for consideration. Board members received in advance and hard copies were available. No further discussion took place and no questions were asked. Planner McKenzie had reviewed the resolution and has endorsed the resolution. A motion was made by Dan Bush and seconded by Tom Scheibener to memorialize the proposed resolution. At a roll call vote all present were in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

### **Public Hearings**

- Block 24 Lot 3 & 13 – Huntington Knolls LLC – Amended Preliminary Major Site Plan – Received into our office May 19, 2014 – 45 day completeness deadline is July 3, 2014. Board Action needed. Judge rec back to PB. Board Action needed. Deemed compete July 14, 2014. Public hearing September 9, 2014.
- The proofs, affidavit, certification list etc have been submitted and are Exhibit A1. The Planning Board has jurisdiction.
- The letter prepared by Maser Consulting dated September 4, 2014 was discussed at the September 8, 2014 meeting.
- At the meeting of September 8, 2014 it was determined that the Board Engineer and Applicant's Engineer would sit down and discuss the plans and iron out the details before bring revised plans to the board for the next meeting to be held on October 13, 2014. The meeting would take place the next week after the planning board meeting. The goal is to move forward. A complete list will be presented to the board. The public hearing will carry to October 13<sup>th</sup> and the Public Hearing can take place. Recreation will also be discussed. Everyone agreed to carry the public hearing till the October 13, 2014 meeting. Attorney Caldwell is on record as saying he will send me a letter in writing but that it is also on the record that he agrees to carry the public hearing. The public will be able to talk at the next meeting. A motion was made by Mike Miller and seconded by Tom Scheibener to carry the public hearing till October 13, 2014. All present were in favor of the motion. Motion carried. No notice is needed.

Attorney Caldwell and Mr. Zederbaum are present. Mr. Zederbaum stated that the meeting did take place and things were ironed out. He expressed issues with the review letter prepared by Maser dated October 11, 2014.

### **MEMORANDUM**

**To: Members of the Holland Township Planning Board**

**From: C. Richard Roseberry PE,  
PP, AICP William H. Burr,  
IV, PE**

**Date: October 11, 2014**

**Re: Huntington Knolls - Technical Review #3 (Phases 2 & 3) and  
Technical Review #2  
(Phase 4)  
Block 24, Lots 3, 13 & 13.01  
Holland Township, Hunterdon County, NJ  
MC Project No. HLP-002**

---

Dear Members of the  
Planning Board:

At your request, following the September 8, 2014 Planning Board meeting, our office met with the applicant's engineer, Mr. Zederbaum to discuss the contents of our September 4, 2014 review correspondence. A meeting was held on Tuesday, September 16, 2014 and attended by Robert Zederbaum and Jim Dougherty of RBZ Enterprises, Inc., as well as, Rick Roseberry and Bill Burr of Maser Consulting, P.A. Subsequent to this meeting, on October 2, 2014, Mr. Zederbaum submitted revised site plans and associated documents to our office. In an effort to provide some constructive feedback in advance of the October 13, 2013 Board meeting, we have performed a partial review of the revised documents focusing mainly on what we deem to be the major issues including recreation and roadway alignment. Please note that this

review is not complete and focuses only on above mentioned items. We have not performed a thorough review of the stormwater management design, site grading, accessibility or utilities.

The following documents were submitted for our review:

- October 2, 2014 response letter from Robert B. Zederbaum, P.E. to C. Richard Roseberry, P.E. and William H. Burr, IV, P.E. regarding the resubmission documents.
- Site Plans (consisting of 48 sheets) as prepared by RBZ Enterprises, Inc., dated July 2013, last revised October 1, 2014.
- Report entitled, “Stormwater Management System, Hydrologic & Hydraulic Analysis, Site Plan for Huntington Knolls” prepared by Robert B. Zederbaum, P.E., dated July 2013, last revised October 2014.
- Report entitled, “Stormwater Management System, Hydrologic & Hydraulic Analysis, Site Plan for Huntington Knolls” prepared by Robert B. Zederbaum, P.E., dated December 2013, last revised October 2014.
- Report entitled, “Access Road Flood Study, HEC-II Analysis, Site Plan for Huntington Knolls” prepared by Robert B. Zederbaum, P.E., dated July 2013, last revised March 2014.
- Report entitled, “Stormwater Collection System, Maintenance Plan, Site Plan for Huntington Knolls” prepared by Robert B. Zederbaum, P.E., dated December 2013, last revised March 2014.
- Request for De Minimis Exceptions from RSIS, dated September 30, 2014.
- Copy of outside agency reviews including:
  - Hunterdon County Planning Board “Conditional Approval Not to Construct”, dated September 22, 2014.
  - Hunterdon County Soil Conservation District “Corrected Letter of Certification”, dated June 25, 2014.
- Email correspondence from John Lago of NJDCA regarding RSIS.

Upon review of the above referenced documents versus our September 4, 2014 correspondence and the discussions at the September 16, 2014 professionals meeting, we offer the following comments (note: comments from our September 4, 2014 correspondence are listed below with our latest comments in **BOLD**. In an effort to condense this report, if a previous comment was addressed with this most recent submission, then we have removed the comment and included “**SATISFIED**” next to the comment number):

**Phase 3 Comments** (follows same order as our February 7, 2014 and September 4, 2014 correspondence with our latest comments in **BOLD**):

1. An Overall Dimension Plan shall be provided showing all the improvements, easements, phase lines, lot lines, buffers, wetlands, etc. Currently, this information is shown on various plans requiring our office to literally overlay the plans on a light board to see if there are conflicts. Several of the sheets have easements from prior plans shown while other sheets have these easements in different locations. It has been quite difficult to review these plans since the information is on different sheets. **Not Satisfied. The current line weights of the various line types makes the plans very difficult to read as many of the lines and text are very similar. We suggest revising the plans so that existing conditions layer be made a lighter line weight while proposed information remain darker – see the previous plan set, dated July 2013, for an example of what we recommend. SATISFIED.**
2. **SATISFIED. The applicant’s attorney has recently submitted a subdivision application for the Board’s review.**
3. **SATISFIED.**
4. **SATISFIED.**
5. The proposed sidewalk is not shown on Sheet 28. **Not Satisfied. It appears that the sidewalk has been removed from the plans even though there still remain some labels**

and other indications of a previously proposed sidewalk. The only sidewalk shown is at the COAH buildings. See comment # 18 below. **PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED A DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION FROM CONSTRUCTING SIDEWALK AS PART OF THIS DEVELOPMENT. SEE SECTION BELOW REGARDING DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION REQUESTS.**

6. **SATISFIED.**

7. The plans need to show where sidewalks and patios will be constructed as well as any outdoor equipment such as mailbox clusters and dumpster/recycling enclosures. **Not Satisfied. It is important that this information be provided on the plans now so that a review can be performed to confirm compliance with ordinance requirements and ensure that the project is actually buildable as proposed. The location of mailbox clusters and dumpsters need to be provided in locations where they meet ADA requirements. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE PLANS HAVE BEEN REVISED TO SHOW A MAILBOX CLUSTER ALONG CLAREMONT DRIVE NEAR THE BEGINNING OF PHASE 3. TESTIMONY SHALL BE PROVIDED TO CLARIFY IF THE USPS POSTMASTER HAS REVIEWED THIS ARRANGEMENT AND WHETHER THE NUMBER OF SPACES PROVIDED IS SUFFICIENT FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT. ADDITIONAL SPOT ELEVATIONS SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO CONFIRM ACCESSIBILITY. A NOTE HAS ALSO BEEN ADDED TO CLARIFY THAT GARBAGE WILL BE PICKED UP INDIVIDUALLY FOR EACH UNIT EXCEPT FOR THE COAH BUILDINGS, WHERE A DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE HAS BEEN PROVIDED.**

8. **SATISFIED.**

9. The current plan with the sidewalk directly adjacent to the road is going to require the curb height to be constantly changing between 6” and 0” to accommodate the curb ramps. These varying curb heights shall be shown on the plan. Our office recommends a design that would have the sidewalk installed 6’ away from the curb and 6” higher than the curb with a landscaped strip between them. This will allow the sidewalk to be built without truncated domes at each driveway and eliminate the varying curb heights on Claremont Drive. **Not Satisfied – the sidewalk appears to have been removed from the plan. See Comment #18 below. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED A DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION FROM CONSTRUCTING SIDEWALK AS PART OF THIS DEVELOPMENT. SEE SECTION BELOW REGARDING DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION REQUESTS.**

10. **SATISFIED.**

11. The pavement specification shall be revised to match RSIS requirements. **Not Satisfied. The pavement section was revised but there are still discrepancies between the pavement section and the roadway sections. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. WE RECOMMEND A PAVEMENT SECTION OF 5” HMA BASE COURSE AND 2” SURFACE COURSE PAVEMENTS.**

12. **SATISFIED.**

13. It was my understanding that the applicant stated they submitted these plans to Hunterdon County for review. I contacted the County and they have not received them. Since the new road will access the County road, we need the County’s input to confirm the new location is acceptable. An application shall be submitted to the County immediately to start the review process. **An application was made to the County and the County subsequently disapproved the application by way of letter dated August 8, 2014. The applicant should provide the Board with an update on the status of the resubmission to the County? PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE APPLICANT HAS RECEIVED CONDITIONAL APPROVAL NOT TO CONSTRUCT BY WAY OF LETTER DATED SEPTEMBER 22, 2014 FROM HUNTERDON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD. TESTIMONY SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO CLARIFY THE STATUS OF REMAINING COUNTY RELATED ITEMS.**

14. **SATISFIED.**

15. **New Comment.** The proposed limits of the recreation area are not clear on the latest plan set. Previous plan revisions had shown playground equipment and notes on the current plan set (Sheet 8) refers to a combination of play areas, trails and a tennis court; however, plan sheet 40 now shows nothing more than a 19,200 SF lawn area with some walking trails. Additional information needs to be provided by the applicant's engineer to clarify the calculations on Sheet 8 as they do not appear to "add up". This issue needs to be discussed by the Board.

We strongly recommend that the applicant provide more substantial recreation components including a mixture of playground equipment, along with walking trails – see below for examples of what the ordinance suggests. We also note that a much more extensive network of trails/pathways could be constructed than what is currently shown.

Condition #19 (now #20) of the Resolution states that "Sufficient recreational facilities shall be provided and shall be shown on the final site plan for Phases II and III to meet the needs of a non age-restricted community. The outdoor recreational areas and facilities that had been shown on the plans for the age-restricted development shall be at least doubled to meet this requirement and shall be subject to the approval by the Board as part of its approval of the final site plan for Phases II and III. Any preliminary site plan approval granted for Phase II shall be subject to modification at the time of final approval to accommodate such additional recreational facilities and any associated parking or access improvements as may be approved by the Planning Board.

The governing Ordinance Section #100-91.14.E(3)(c) – Development requirements specific to planned senior village developments indicates that "Not less than 5% of the developed area of the PSV, and excluding public open space lands, shall be developed for outdoor recreational use. This may include swimming pools and related facilities, shuffleboard and horseshoe courts, tennis courts, and other appropriate facilities and the immediately surrounding lawns and parking areas". We assume that this is where the initial recreational proposal originated from. Testimony and plan revisions/calculations will be necessary to confirm that the above ordinance and resolution requirements have been adequately satisfied.

It is also important to note that the proposed recreation areas are currently shown within the 300 ft. SWRPA/Riparian Zone. The applicant's engineer should comment upon the impact of the recreation areas being located within these environmentally sensitive areas, in particular if the Board requires playground equipment or other recreation improvements other than "open lawn space" as currently shown. A letter has been received from the NJDEP, dated July 2, 2014, stating that the pathways shall be relocated to a point no more than 40' from the proposed buildings and all structures and development shall be outside the SWRPA and Riparian Zone. Additionally, the DEP is requiring all areas within 300' of the SWRPA/Riparian Zone to be protected with a conservation easement and planted with a mix of trees and shrubs. Obviously, if the DEP requires the area to revert to a natural succession area, it cannot be used as a recreation area.

**PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE PLANS HAVE BEEN REVISED TO SHOW A MORE SUBSTANTIAL RECREATION COMPONENT INCLUDING FOUR (4)**

**3,315 S.F. PLAY AREAS WHICH INCLUDE A MIX OF PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT, A GAZEBO, BENCHES AND PICNIC TABLES, ALONG WITH AN**

**8,525 S.F. GRASS AREA AND 1,877 S.F. OF TRAILS. BASED ON OUR INITIAL REVIEW, THESE PLANS APPEAR TO COMPLY WITH THE OVERALL**

**AMOUNT OF RECREATION REQUIRED BY THE RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL; HOWEVER, THE BOARD SHOULD REVIEW SPECIFICALLY**

**WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED TO DETERMINE IF THE CURRENT PROPOSAL IS APPROPRIATE FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT. ONCE THE BOARD AND APPLICANT HAVE AGREED TO SPECIFICALLY WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED, ADDITIONAL DETAILS WILL NEED TO BE ADDED TO THE PLANS**

**INCLUDING DIMENSIONS, SURFACE MATERIALS, ETC. WE ALSO BELIEVE THERE IS STILL AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE A MORE EXPANSION**

**TRAIL NETWORK. THE APPLICANT'S ENGINEER SHOULD ALSO COMMENT ON WHETHER THE RECREATION AREAS WILL BE IMPACTED BY NJDEP'S REVIEW OF THIS PROJECT.**

**Grading Comments:**

16. SATISFIED.

17. SATISFIED.

18. The Grading Plan on Sheet 8 does not show the sidewalk proposed along Claremont Drive. **Not Satisfied. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED A DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION FROM CONSTRUCTING SIDEWALK AS PART OF THIS DEVELOPMENT. SEE SECTION BELOW REGARDING DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION REQUESTS.**

19. SATISFIED.

**Road Comments:**

20. The plan has been prepared with a 24' wide road with sidewalk on one (1) side. This does not conform to the requirements of a Residential Access Street in the Residential Site Improvement Standards. RSIS requires a 28' wide street that would allow parking on one side. **Not Satisfied. As mentioned above the previously proposed sidewalk has been removed from the plans. We recommend that, at a minimum, a sidewalk be provided along one (1) side of the road(s) throughout the development. Our office would support a de-minimus exception to allow a 24' wide road width instead of a 28' width, but not the removal of sidewalks. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED A DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION FROM CONSTRUCTING A 28 FT. WIDE ROAD AND IS PROPOSED INSTEAD A 24 FT. WIDE ROAD AS PART OF THIS DEVELOPMENT. SEE SECTION BELOW REGARDING DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION REQUESTS.**

21. SATISFIED.

22. The plans do not show any signs or striping. In the area of the COAH units, a turnaround area is required for Fire Truck access per the RSIS. **Not Satisfied. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE PLANS HAVE BEEN REVISED TO SHOW SIGNAGE AND STRIPING ONLY IN THE AREAS OF THE DEVELOPMENT. WE RECOMMEND THAT ADDITIONAL SPEED LIMIT SIGNS BE PLACED ALONG CLAREMONT DRIVE MID-WAY BETWEEN ROUTE 519 AND THE FIRST TOWNHOUSE BUILDINGS. IN ADDITION, THE APPLICANT'S ENGINEER SHOULD INDICATE WHETHER A SUBMISSION HAS BEEN MADE TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW?**

23. SATISFIED.

24. **SATISFIED. THE PARKING CALCULATIONS OF SHEET 7 HAVE BEEN REVISED TO MATCH THE NUMBER OF SPACES PROPOSED ON THE PLANS.**

25. The grading of Claremont Drive at the intersection of Route 519 requires revision. Plan Sheet 13 depicts the plan and profile but does not contain any horizontal geometry. Road width, radiuses, curbs, etc. shall be shown. The design of the road has the crown extending to the edge of pavement of 519 without a vertical curve transition. In all likelihood, the County will require their typical road intersection that will have the curbline set at 23' from the centerline of the road. **Not Satisfied. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE APPLICANT HAS RECEIVED CONDITIONAL APPROVAL NOT TO CONSTRUCT FROM THE COUNTY.**

26. The proposed grading near the intersection of Claremont Drive and Route 519 will cause ponding on the northwest corner and force the stormwater into the travel lanes of Route 519. It would appear that a cross drain will be needed at this location. **Not Satisfied. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE APPLICANT HAS RECEIVED**

**CONDITIONAL APPROVAL NOT TO CONSTRUCT FROM THE COUNTY.**

27. **SATISFIED.**

28. Sight distance lines shall be provided around each of the horizontal curves based on a 25 mph speed limit. The area within the sight lines shall be kept clear and open. **Not Satisfied. NOT SATISFIED. TESTIMONY SHALL BE PROVIDED TO CLARIFY THIS ISSUE.**

29. The road profile shall be revised so that the crest vertical curves do not have a K value less than 12 and the sag vertical curves cannot have a K value less than 26. This is based on a 25 mph design speed. **Not Satisfied. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. ALL VERTICAL CURVES HAVE BEEN REVISED TO COMPLY WITH RSIS EXCEPT FOR THE INTERSECTION CURVE BETWEEN CLAREMONT DRIVE AND THE PHASE 4 ROAD. A DE MINIMUS EXCEPTION HAS BEEN REQUESTED FOR THIS – SEE BELOW.**

30. **SATISFIED.**

31. **SATISFIED. A HAMMERHEAD TURN AROUND AREA IS PROPOSED AT THE END OF PHASE 3 WITH NOTES IN THE EVENT THAT PHASE 3 AND 4 ARE NOT CONSTRUCTED AT THE SAME TIME.**

**ADA Comments:**

32. The plans have been revised to include five (5) recreation areas on the north side of the site with four (4) play areas and one (1) grass play area. The Board will need to determine if the facilities proposed in the play area are appropriate for the development. The plans will need to be amended to show that each of the recreational areas provide handicap accessible routes to each of them. The ADA regulations require that all of the recreational facilities have an accessible route from all of the residential units. This will be nearly impossible to achieve on the site due to topography, so a parking area must be provided for the recreational area with sufficient parking for both handicapped and non-handicapped individuals. An accessible route must then be provided from the parking lot to all of the recreational areas. The plan shall include a profile of the accessible routes, a detail of their construction, and railings where needed. Walking trails do not need to be ADA accessible unless they are part of the accessible route between the parking areas and the recreational areas. **Not Satisfied. The plans have been revised to now only show one 19,200 SF “rec area” along with a wooded trail. The plans still lack sufficient information to determine compliance with the ADA recreation requirement. This is a topic that must be discussed further with the Board. See Comment #15 above. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE RECREATIONAL COMPONENT HAS BEEN ENHANCED IN THIS LATEST PLAN REVISION AND ONCE THE BOARD AND APPLICANT AGREE ON THE PROPOSAL, A MORE DETAILED REVIEWED OF THE PROPOSED LOCATIONS SPOT ELEVATIONS WILL NEED TO BE PERFORMED TO CONFIRM COMPLIANCE WITH ADA ACCESSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.**

33. The COAH units shall be reviewed by the Construction Official for ADA accessibility and adaptability. **Not Satisfied. PARTIALLY SATISFIED. A NOTE HAS BEEN ADDED TO THE PLANS INDICATING THAT THE PLANS MUST BE REVISED BY THE CONSTRUCTION OFFICIAL. WERE PLANS SUBMITTED TO THE CONSTRUCTION OFFICIAL YET?**

34. **SATISFIED.**

35. Dimensions of all accessible parking spaces and van accessible parking spaces shall be shown on the plans. Spot elevations shall be provided at all accessible parking spaces to confirm that they do not exceed the maximum cross slope requirements. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

**Drainage Comments: (NOTE – AS MENTIONED ABOVE, THIS OFFICE HAS NOT REVIEWED THE REVISED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT CALCULATIONS).**

36. Both of the proposed detention facilities have earth berms over 10' tall and will be considered to be dams per the DEP. Approval from the NJDEP Bureau of Dam Safety is required. Sheets 8 and 9 detail the grading for the detention basins, which is inconsistent with the grading shown on the rest of the plans. Construction of this type of basin does not allow full excavation during construction. At least 2' of the bottom of the basin must remain in place to allow sediment to accumulate. At the conclusion of the site work, the bottom 2' of the basin gets excavated to the infiltration level. The plan shall clearly state the sequence of construction. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
37. **SATISFIED.**
38. **SATISFIED.**
39. Our office did not review the SWRPA Plan, understanding that the DEP will review it and the applicant will need to comply with their regulations. **Based on the July 2, 2014 letter from the NJDEP, modifications need to be made to the plans to comply with the SWRPA requirements. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME. APPLICANT'S ENGINEER SHOULD PROVIDE TESTIMONY TO CLARIFY STATUS OF SUBMISSION TO NJDEP?**
40. The plans do not provide enough detail how the stormwater from the east side of Claremont Drive will be managed in the vicinity of Route 519. The plan shows a swale terminating at the edge of a grass area, but no topographic information is shown to identify the flow path and whether it will flow to the street or adjacent stream. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME, ALTHOUGH COUNTY HAS ISSUED CONDITIONAL APPROVAL NOT TO CONSTRUCT.**
41. **SATISFIED.**
42. The plan shows a diversion swale across the upper areas of Phase 4. This swale does not terminate at a defined discharge point. Stability calculations shall be provided downstream of the swale. It would appear that the swale needs to be extended to a defined drainage path. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
43. The Tc for Post Development Area 1 shall be verified. The value has been manually input. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
44. The 150' sheet flow in the Post Development Impervious bypass does not seem realistic since it occurs on a paved street. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
45. **SATISFIED.**
46. The Pond Report for Basin #1 does not match the plans or details. The pipe sizes and invert elevations don't match and the primary and secondary orifices have been reversed. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
47. **SATISFIED.**
48. Both of the drainage area boundaries do not include any off-site area. Only the on-site area is required to meet the rate reduction requirements, but the entire drainage area, including off-site area must be used for the pipe sizing and basin routings. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
49. Typically, the Conservation District (HCSCD) does not allow exfiltration in the basin for the 2 and 10 year storm events. RSIS does not address this issue, but confirmation from the District should be obtained prior to resubmitting new calculations. **Not Satisfied. PLANS HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY HUNTERDON COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT.**



50. Calculations shall be provided to show the velocity through the trash racks in the outlet structures does not exceed 2.5 fps. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
51. Drainage area plans shall be provided to support the areas used in the swale calculations.  
**Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
52. Calculations shall be submitted to show the existing 36" pipe is capable of handling the 100 year storm event. It would appear that a headwall is needed at the upstream end of the 36" culvert. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
53. **SATISFIED.**
54. Many of the swales have velocities over 4 fps, but do not address how they are proposed to be stabilized. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
55. The drainage plan has been designed for all of the roof runoff from the townhouses on the north side of the street to be connected to the collection system in the street. The plans shall detail piping of the roof leaders for all the gutters on these units to insure this is feasible. If patios are proposed for these units, they shall be included as impervious area in the post development bypass area calculations. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
56. The collection system calculations in the report do not include the COAH units and parking lot. **Not Satisfied. NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
57. **SATISFIED. THE PLANS HAVE BEEN REVISED TO ADD DOUBLE "B" INLETS AT INLETS 1 & 2 TO ENSURE THAT ALL RUNOFF WILL BE DIRECTED TO THE DETENTION BASIN.**
58. **SATISFIED.**
59. **SATISFIED.**

### **Landscaping**

#### **Comments:**

60. The Landscaping Plan will need to be revised to eliminate the trees on the detention basin berms. Since the detention basins will be considered dams, trees on the berms are not allowed. **Not Satisfied. THIS DOES NOT APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED.**
61. The Landscaping Plan does not show the perimeter buffering plants that the applicant agreed to install in Phase 2. **NOTES WERE ADDED TO THE PLANS HOWEVER WE DEFER TO THE BOARD PLANNER FOR COMMENT ON THIS ISSUE.**

#### **Water Comments:**

62. The plans shall be reviewed by the Fire Marshall for approval of the hydrant locations.  
There may also be the need for water storage for fighting purposes. The applicant's engineer shall provide information regarding the ability of the designed water system to provide sufficient pressure and volume per RSIS. **Not Satisfied. THE APPLICANT'S ENGINEER SHALL PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON THE SUBMISSIONS TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT AND WATER COMPANY?**
63. **New Comment.** Only 2 fire hydrants are shown on the plans. RSIS requires the hydrants to be located at specific distances to provide coverage for all buildings. **NOT SATISFIED.**

#### **Coordination:**

64. It appears that this plan will require the following approvals: **Not Satisfied.**  
**THE APPLICANT'S ENGINEER SHOULD PROVIDE THE BOARD WITH AN UPDATE ON ALL OUTSIDE AGENCY REVIEWS/APPROVALS.**
- i. DEP for Wetlands Disturbance
  - ii. DEP for Flood Hazard Area Disturbance
  - iii. DEP for Dam Safety
  - iv. DEP for amended TWA for the additional units in Phase 3.
  - v. Hunterdon County Planning Board
  - vi. Hunterdon County Soil Conservation District
  - vii. DEP RFA General Permit for Construction Activities
  - viii. DEP for water extension
  - ix. DEP TWA for sanitary sewer extension
65. Prior to Final Approval, a cost estimate shall be provided by the applicant's engineer for review and approval by this office. A performance guarantee in the amount of 120% of the approved cost estimate shall be posted with the Township, of which 10% shall be in cash. The applicant shall also post an inspection fee deposit in the amount of 5% of the approved cost estimate for municipal inspections. **Not Satisfied. WE AGREE THAT THIS ISSUE COULD BE HANDLED AS A CONDITION OF ANY BOARD APPROVAL.**

**Phase 4 – Technical Comments** (follows same order as our September 4, 2014 correspondence with our latest comments in **BOLD**):

1. **SATISFIED.**
2. **SATISFIED. THE PHASING PLAN HAS BEEN REVISED TO REFLECT 12 COAH UNITS TO BE CONSTRUCTED AS PART OF PHASE 3 AND THE REMAINING 14 COAH UNITS INCLUDED AS PART OF PHASE 4.**
3. **SATISFIED.**
4. The Board should obtain testimony to clarify how garbage and recycling will be handled? **PARTIALLY SATISFIED. A NOTE HAS BEEN ADDED TO THE PLANS INDICATING THAT GARBAGE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION FOR EACH UNIT WILL BE HANDLED VIA CURBSIDE PICKUP. A DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE HAS BEEN PROPOSED FOR THE COAH UNITS. IS THIS ENCLOSURE LARGE ENOUGH FOR BOTH GARBAGE AND RECYCLING?**
5. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's engineer clarifying the earthwork (i.e. cuts/fills) for each phase of the project and overall impact on the development? **THE APPLICANT'S ENGINEER HAS INDICATED THAT HE HAS NOT REVIEWED THE EARTHWORK INVOLVED WITH THIS PROJECT.**
6. **SATISFIED.**
7. **SATISFIED.**
8. Sheet 29 and a few other plan sheets now appear to show a retaining wall to the rear of the building on the south side of Claremont Drive at Sta. 18+0. The plans need to be revised to clearly label this feature and also provide a construction detail. **PARTIALLY SATISFIED. A DETAIL OF THE WALL HAS BEEN ADDED; HOWEVER, THIS STRUCTURE SHOULD BE LABELED ON THE GRADING SHEETS AS WELL.**
9. **SATISFIED.**
10. The plans should clarify where mailboxes will be situated. Will community mailboxes be utilized? If so, these areas need to be accessible and may need designated parking spaces allocated to ensure safety, access, etc. **A CLUSTER MAILBOX HAS BEEN PROPOSED  
– SEE NOTE #7 ABOVE.**

**Grading Comments:**

11. **SATISFIED.**

12. The proposed grading around the COAH buildings appears to encroach on the limit of disturbance line. **PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE COAH BUILDINGS APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN MOVED CLOSER TO TOGETHER AND CLOSER TO THE PROPOSED ROAD. WHY?**

13. **SATISFIED.**

14. Many proposed contours on the various plan sheets are incomplete or don't show how the proposed contours will tie into the existing contours. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

**Road Comments:**

15. Additional spot elevations need to be provided throughout the Phase 4 road and within the parking areas to ensure positive drainage to the proposed inlets. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

16. **SATISFIED.**

**ADA Comments:**

17. On the COAH Unit Plan (Sheet 29), dimensions of all accessible parking spaces and van accessible parking spaces shall be shown on the plans. Spot elevations shall be provided at all accessible parking spaces to confirm that they do not exceed the maximum cross slope requirements. In addition, the access ramps need to be clearly drawn, dimensioned and spot elevations provided to confirm compliance with ADA requirements. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

18. **SATISFIED.**

**Drainage Comments:**

19. There are numerous discrepancies on the various plan and profiles sheets with the storm sewer information between the actual plan view versus the profiles (i.e. pipe size, slopes, inverts, etc.). **PARTIALLY SATISFIED. MANY DISCREPANCIES HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED; HOWEVER, THERE IS STILL ONE ON SHEET 17 – HDPE PIPE SLOPE 5.36% VS. 5.58%.**

20. The Stormwater Management Report, revised through March 2014 still contains references and various calculations based on two (2) detention basins; however, the plans have been revised to include only (1) basin. These discrepancies need to be addressed and the SW report needs to be updated to correspond with the most current plan set. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME**

21. The stormwater report includes “Phase 3 Only” calculations for the stormwater basin – what about Phase 4? **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

22. The rip-rap design section of the stormwater report appears to still reflect calculations from previous plan sets. This section needs to be updated. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

23. Swale calculations in the SW report do not correspond with what is currently proposed on the plans. In addition to revising this information to match the plans, additional labeling needs to be provided on the plans to clarify the proposed swale design and stabilization measures. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

24. Pipe capacity calculations need to be provided in the SW report. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

25. The Detention Basin Plan (Sheet 10) needs to be revised to address discrepancies and/or missing information regarding the grading at the emergency spillway. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

26. The Detention Basin Plan also contains notes regarding a curb and inlet at the inlet to the basin but it is unclear from the information shown what exactly is intended in this area. Additional information and construction details should be provided. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
27. The plans call for a bio-retention trench in the proposed detention basin. Additional notes need to be added to the plans to confirm compliance with the NJ BMP manual – recommend using the “Recommendations and Considerations” notes from the BMP manual. The plan should contain adequate notes to clarify how the infiltration basin will be protected during construction. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME**
28. The Detention Basin Bioretention System Detail on Sheet 11 shall be revised to reflect the proposed thickness. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
29. **SATISFIED.**
30. The proposed swales should be clearly labeled on the plans to clarify whether they are diversion swales or roadside swales to match the construction details. **NOT REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**
31. **SATISFIED.**
32. A Stormwater Operations & Maintenance Manual shall be provided in accordance with the NJ BMP manual. **AN O&M MANUAL HAS BEEN PROVIDED HOWEVER IT HAS NOT BEEN REVIEWED AT THIS TIME.**

**Landscaping Comments:**

33. The proposed landscaping along the roadway at the transition between the end of Phase 3 and beginning of Phase 4 is not consistent. **NOT SATISFIED.**
34. The landscape plans do not show the required perimeter buffer plantings in accordance with Condition #12 (now #13) of the Board’s Resolution. **NOTES HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE PLAN - WE DEFER TO BOARD PLANNER FOR COMMENT ON THIS ITEM.**

**Lighting Comments:**

35. Additional information needs to be provided on the proposed street lighting including: **PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED AS REQUESTED BELOW HOWEVER ADDITIONAL LIGHTS MAY BE NECESSARY (IN PARTICULAR IN PHASE 4) TO ADDRESS POTENTIAL DARK AREAS.**
  - Height of lights
  - Wattage
  - Notes regarding down-shielding
  - Show light intensity (footcandles) – existing information is not legible.
36. The Utility and Lighting Plan (Sheet 21) contains a large black area – what is this supposed to be? **PARTIALLY SATISFIED. THE WATER MAIN IS PROPOSED TO RUN NORTH ALONG COUNTY ROUTE 519 (OUTSIDE OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY LIMITS) TO CONNECT TO AN EXISTING 8” WATERLINE AT THE FOX HILL CONDOS. THIS WORK APPEARS TO BE PROPOSED ON PRIVATE PROPERTY – HAS PERMISSION BEEN RECEIVED FOR THIS? AN EASEMENT WOULD BE NECESSARY.**

37. **SATISFIED.**

**Water Comments:**

38. The plans show a water storage tank area and access driveway to the rear of a building at Sta. 6+50 in Phase 4 of the development. Testimony should be provided to clarify when this

tank

is proposed to be constructed. Additional notes may need to be added to the plans to clarify

this. Will there be a gate at this access driveway? If so, it should be noted on the plans. There should also be a construction detail for the proposed access driveway material. Is the storage tank above ground – will the area be surrounded with a fence? Additional information needs to be provided. **NOT SATISFIED.**

### **Additional Plan Revisions**

At the Board's July & August 2014 meetings, the applicant agreed to provide the following information:

1. Patios (or proof of rear access) were to be shown on the plans, where possible (on a case-by-case basis), at the units in accordance with Condition #18 (now #19) of the Resolution. **SATISFIED - NOTES HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE PLANS.**
2. The plans were to be revised to reflect 11 COAH units as part of Phase 3 with the remaining units shown as part of Phase 4. **SATISFIED – THE PLAN HAVE BEEN REVISED TO REFLECT 12 COAH UNITS AS PART OF PHASE 3 AND 14 UNITS AS PART OF PHASE 4. THE BOARD PLANNER SHOULD ALSO COMMENT ON THIS ISSUE.**
3. Revised architectural plans were to be submitted. **NOT SATISFIED.**
4. Landscape perimeter buffering was to be shown. **NOTES HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE PLANS – WE DEFER TO THE BOARD PLANNER FOR COMMENT ON THIS ISSUE.**
5. Clarify total number of units being proposed on this project as there appears to be some conflicting throughout the plans, resolutions, etc. **THE PLANS REFLECT A TOTAL OF 133 UNITS BEING PROPOSED AT THIS TIME INCLUDING 1 FARMETTE (PHASE 2), 44 TOWNHOUSE & 12 COAH UNITS (PAHSE 3) AND 62 TOWNHOUSES & 14 COAH UNITS (PHASE 4).**

These revisions have not been made on the plans that were the subject of this review.

6. Based on the July 2, 2014 letter from the NJDEP, the driveway/road construction for Block 24, Lot 3 has been constructed through wetlands and crosses a stream without any permits and is the subject of an enforcement action. Our office recommends that any approvals (including the approval of the Phase 2 farmette) should be conditioned upon the applicant obtaining the wetlands and flood hazard permits for the driveway and satisfying the conditions of the permit. It is possible that the NJDEP may require the driveway and/or stream crossing to be relocated or replaced. Since this is the only access to the property, this issue needs to be resolved before any permits are issued. **HAVE NJDEP PERMIT APPLICATIONS BEEN SUBMITTED YET?**

### **Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) De Minimus Exceptions**

As required, the applicant's engineer has requested (in writing) several de minimus exceptions from RSIS including:

1. Cartway Width – RSIS requires a 28 ft. wide road, while the applicant is proposing a 24 ft. wide road. The applicant's engineer should provide testimony to support this request. We are supportive of this request.
2. Sidewalks – RSIS requires sidewalk on one side of the road; however, the applicant is not proposing any sidewalks. The applicant's engineer should provide testimony to support this request. We are not supportive of this request as we feel sidewalks should be provided to allow residents and visitors to safely navigate through the development to reach the mailbox clusters, recreation areas and any other places of interest on the property.
3. Curves – The applicant is proposing to make the Phase 4 road near the intersection

with Claremont Drive steeper than allowed by RSIS. The applicant's engineer should provide testimony to support this request. We are not supportive of this request as we feel the vertical alignment of the roadways should meet the RSIS requirements for safety purposes.

In summary, much work has been done to the plans to address many of our previous comments. However, there still remain a few unresolved issues which will need to be discussed with the Board including the waiver (de minimus exceptions) requests and the recreation component. In addition, as mentioned above, this memorandum only represents a partial review and does not include a review of the updated stormwater management calculations, grading or accessibility issues. A full review of these issues will be needed after the October 13, 2014 Board meeting.

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact this office at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Zederbaum specifically wanted to address the **Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) De Minimus Exceptions**. Each component was discussed in detail with the applicant expressing why they were asking the waiver and the board and the board professionals asking questions. #1 – cartway width – Mr. Zederbaum believes that 24' is better for this project. Engineer Burr stated that although they support the proposed width this is tied to #2 and the board has to address the sidewalk issue. If the road is 28' then a sidewalk might not be needed but if you reduce the road to 24' then a sidewalk might be a consideration. Mr. Zederbaum proposes only a sidewalk on one side of the road. The applicant stated that although the road is to be 25 MPH they would like to only see 15 MPH as the enforceable speed limit. The project does not connect to pedestrian pathways. The applicant believes sidewalks are not needed and that people can walk in the street to walk around, get the school bus or even get the mail. Most people drive anyhow is what the applicants expressed. They are trying to cut down on impervious coverage. Mr. Zederbaum expressed that it is a logical approach. The board engineer does not share that opinion. They have the right to ask it but safety needs to be a concern of the board. Some board questions included....is this development connected to anything else (no), the width of the sidewalks (about 4'), the bus stop (end of the road), recreation (near the bottom – playground is 700-800 feet from the road with parking and handicapped accessibility), and the mailbox location (near the bottom). Additional discussion took place about reducing the road to 20' and Engineer Burr stated that the project is in the category of multi-family which RSIS states should be 28'. 24' is a reasonable reduction but 20' is not. Planner McKenzie reminded the board that sidewalks are good as you have adults and children walking around this project for a host of different reasons from getting the mail to going to school to be health conscious to going to the passive recreational areas including playgrounds. Planner McKenzie also stated that although there are other single family homes in a development in Holland Township they are different in comparison to an intensive development. Planner McKenzie stated that she believes that RSIS standards were created for a reason. Engineer Burr agrees with Planner McKenzie. Both professionals agree that if the board reduces the roadway to 24' then at least one sidewalk is recommended. It allows people to get around safely. Engineer Zederbaum then reminded the board that this is a COAH project and the board is obligated to work with the applicant to keep costs down with Planner McKenzie responding that while that is true RSIS is the minimum and maximum standards accepted by the state and so to therefore use RSIS as the guideline for standards is in fact normal. Planner McKenzie reminded the board that the applicant has to show a reason and findings for them to grant De Minimus Exceptions. Engineer Zederbaum believes he has made the case why he does not think sidewalks are necessary for this project.

The next conversation was regarding curves. The applicant wants to reduce the speed. They believe the narrower the road is then the slower people drive. They want to design for 15 MPH. At Phase 3 and Phase 4 there is a proposed stop intersection. To design that curve for 25 MPH then the applicant will need a bigger cut and they believe that the road should not be 25 MPH. A 14' cuts makes no sense to Mr. Zederbaum. Mr. Burr expressed that when reviewing this topic they approached it differently. Maser expressed concern about the danger for people to come down a 14' grade and to have to stop. In fact they expressed that building on the other side appears unsafe to them. From a safety concept they are not in favor of what the applicant proposes. Planner McKenzie asked about winter conditions and Engineer Zederbaum stated there is not effect as people have to slow down. He is confused as to the discussions as what he proposes just makes more sense. To not do this in his opinion is to just be moving a lot of dirt for no reason. More discussion took place regarding the design being for a 25 MPH road and the wish to post it for a 15 MPH road. Planner McKenzie offered an idea to switch back to soften the grade and Engineer Zederbaum said NO. He said what he proposes is the best plan and he looked at all different ways around this to avoid discussing with the board. A site plan review discussion took place along with additional cut discussions. Planner McKenzie reminded all that there has to be findings. RSIS, consistency with the intent of the act, reasonable limited with the developer and the people, meets the needs of public health and safety and the infrastructure for future project which there is nothing for that.

The board decided to deal with each issue separately. A motion was made by Mike Miller and seconded by Dan Bush to grant the cartway exception for the road to be 24'. At a roll call vote all present were in favor with the exception of Dave Grossmueller who voted no. Motion carried. A motion was made by Tom Scheibener and seconded by Dan Bush to deny the sidewalk request for reasons of safety, pedestrian walking etc. At a roll call vote all present were in favor of the motion except Mike Miller who voted no. Motion carried. The applicant will have to put in a sidewalk. A motion was made by Tom Scheibener and seconded by Dan Bush to deny the curve exception for the reasons of safety, meeting RSIS standards etc. At a roll call vote, five present were in favor of the motion and four present voted No. Motion carried. To recap...The applicant can do a 24' road, must have a sidewalk and cannot do the curve.

At 8:30 a five minute break was taken and at 8:36 the public hearing was resumed.

More discussion of the Maser letter took place. Item 15 page 4. When the age restriction was removed the applicant agreed to double the playground. It was decided passive recreation was what was needed. If you look at sheet 8 you will see the overall grading plan. There are 5 different play areas shown with walking paths. Sheet 40 shows the proposal. The

westerly area shows play #4 with picnic tables. Continue westerly to play area #3 which has benches and is a tot lot (swings, play equipment for ages 2 to 5 – created by PlayTime). Continue west to area #2 which is passive gazebo – benches, lawn area for hanging out. Then head to area #1 - - benches and a playground for 6 to 12 consisting of real swings and climbing structures. Head further west to a flat grass area to kick a ball. There is a parking area. Paths are handicapped accessible. Maser is ok with the proposal but the board needs to decide if they like it. Some board members wanted to make sure the areas are accessible for the handicapped and were assured that they are. Some questions evolved about the need to have the area where it is a not inter mingled with the project and the applicant stated that this location meets the handicap requirements and is the best location. The applicant will work with the board engineer with materials involved. A motion was made by Dan Bush and seconded by Duane Young to accept the recreation area as proposed on sheets 8 and 40. At a roll call vote, all present voted in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

Planner McKenzie had some questions regarding sheet 7 of 48, note 1 – 5<sup>th</sup> line and note 2 storage of garbage. Attorney Caldwell agreed to the comments. Landscaping discussions were more heated. It is part of the resolution but the applicant does not show it on the plans. Engineer Zederbaum says as agreed they will work with existing vegetation. He does not want to be held to what is put on paper. They will replant and they will work with the home owners in the area as agreed. Attorney Morrow stated that the agreement should be to the satisfaction of the board engineer and professionals. All agreed. More discussion took place and it was suggested that the applicant should start working on a plan. They need to talk with the owners. They need to go out and look at the site. They can start doing a mockup of what they think should be landscaped. Landscape architects visual what is needed and neighbors can weigh in. Phase 3 can be approved with a plan to be down the road. Winter is a good time to start this. The board needs to visualize this. After much discussion everyone agreed including Attorney Caldwell that the Landscape Plan to be submitted six months prior to first co of phase 3 with consideration to walk in the winter and to take pictures too. Planner McKenzie said it will be in the resolution for Phase 3 as a modification. In Item 25 phase is misspelled. Drainage calculations are an engineering item and not a board item. Discussion of item 28 took place with the outcome being that the engineers will work out the differences. Outside agency discussions included the TWA being signed by council and on the way to Milford, unconditional approval by HC, the water company submittal should be soon, a DEP resubmittal and other issues are technical and engineer based. Mr. Burr said that if the board agrees that the engineers can handle the partially satisfied and not satisfied issues then everything has been addressed. Planner McKenzie stated that Architectural drawings for COAH and mix are something we need to see revised plans for. More discussion took place. Mike Miller stated that stated that page 11 mentions a fire Marshall. Carl Molter, a Landscape Designer expressed concerns with street trees suggested and was not thrilled with the plan offered as he suggests cohesiveness with the plantings. After additional discussion, Mr. Molter will work in conjunction with Maser Consulting with this aspect of the plans. The applicant agreed.

The public portion was opened.

Mike Pirrotti - - 150 Spring Garden Road - - buffer conversation. Can you leave big trees in place? If you remove them then they are hard to replace. It would also act as a buffer during construction. Also questioned the pipeline as they have been to his property. It could run thru the Huntington Knolls project. Engineer Zederbaum said regarding vegetation the applicant does want to touch base with property owners to discuss. They will try to minimize disturbance. They cannot give a limit of disturbance but will try to minimize what they can. Building 2 on the far west shows grading close to the property line. They are trying not to disturb the natural vegetation. The applicant is in favor of using what they can and not having to replant a lot.

There were no other comments from the public. The public portion is closed.

There were no other comments from the board or its professionals. A motion was made by Dan Bush and seconded by Duane Young to authorize the preparation of a resolution for granting conditional approval for phase 3 and phase 4 for the board to review and memorialize at the next meeting with the understanding that the Phase 3 landscaping plan discussion to take place in the future and Maser Consulting to deal with all outstanding issues and also subject to all other conditions discussed tonight. At a roll call vote, all present were in favor of the motion. Motion carried.

Attorney Morrow and Attorney Caldwell to talk tomorrow regarding the court meeting.

### **Sub-Committee Status and Updates:**

- ❖ Holland Township Waste Water Management Plan Second Draft2 (10-07-13) – Highlands Council - -Township Committee update. Engineer Burr to discuss with Engineer Roseberry the status of the resubmittal.
- ❖ Checklist change requests:
  - Checklist Requirement for Historic Preservation Commission Review – Tabled
  - Checklist Requirement for Electronic Versions of all Application Materials –Tabled.

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments made.

### **Executive Session**

There was no executive session.

### **Adjournment**

Dan Bush made a motion to adjourn. Motion approved. The meeting ended at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Maria Elena Jennette Kozak*

Maria Elena Jennette Kozak

Secretary